

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

atomic scientist could watch a fellow worker passing scientific data to the enemy and not consider it important enough to tell his superiors, and some Americans censure the Government for refusing to trust him.

More recently, two Americans fled from security posts to Russia with more secret information. And another American, given a passport by State Department officials when a Supreme Court decision compelled them to do so, turns up in Moscow, with more information for the opposition.

No wonder Khrushchev can put on such a display as he did in the United Nations. But that is less disturbing than the fact that some Americans do not see the danger of these things; more, they even defend them.

When a high school youth refused an award from the American Legion and spoke slurringly of that organization, that was a small matter. What did matter was that a national magazine made a hero of the youth, whose education had gone wrong somewhere.

What does cause such opinions among the youth? I think that somewhere along the line their education went wrong, either because of their teachers or the textbooks.

All too often young people think an act is not wrong unless they get caught. In their mixed-up ideology, they think if they can get away with something, there is nothing wrong in it, instead of thinking that wrong is wrong even if you don't get caught.

In my youth, and later, when I was teaching, it seemed to me the only accepted attitude was loyalty to the Nation. We assumed that while we were not perfect, our Government was the best possible one and we could always strive to correct its imperfections. Disloyalty, however, was unthinkable, and had it shown up, no one would have had the temerity to defend it. Benedict Arnold would have had no defenders.

Of course, those who oppose the loyalty oath are in the minority, but nowadays minorities can be noisier than the great majority, which complacently assumes that nothing will come of the opposition.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut has said " * * * the vociferous minority among the educational community has blown this issue up into a major controversy."

From the noise made by this minority, one would think most college students were being kept from making loans because of the required oath. Legion figures, however, bear out Senator Dodd's claim that only a minority is affected. The figures as of last July 1 are: 26 colleges block loans to their students; 60 colleges allow their students to participate, but protest; 1,300 colleges participate without objections; 130,000 students participate; and an estimated 6,000 to 10,000 students are prevented by their schools from applying.

What are the facts in the controversy? The Government permits defense funds to be granted as loans to students they believe will contribute something to the national strength by getting an education. No one is required to participate; the Government does not ask the student to make a loan. It is the student who asks the Government for help.

The Government, in risking tax money, should certainly have the right to ask the student to affirm his loyalty. For his part, why should any student object to such a modest qualification?

Opponents say others receive loans without taking a loyalty oath. But if it is a crop loan, the crop is collateral; for a home loan, a mortgage protects the Government. For a student loan, the only collateral is good faith, patriotism, loyalty, devotion to his country.

If the student is unwilling to take the oath because of disloyalty or of mixed-up ideology, he is a poor risk. Loyalty is a fundamental if the student is to make some contribution when he is educated.

George Sokolsky has said that we have lost the old self-reliance that used to be the strong point of the American. We have come to look to the Government for many things we used to do for ourselves. But objectors to the loyalty oath want the Government to do something for them without even admitting gratitude to the point of loyalty.

In a speech on the Senate floor, Senator DODD said that this minority (of the colleges) "has stirred up resentment against the U.S. Government and blown up this controversy to as great a size as it could. The fact is that a minority of colleges and universities is boycotting the U.S. Government and, having done so, has the gall to claim they are the offended parties, that they are the innocent victims of friction and suspicion and resentment."

Minority or not, the opposition fought for the repeal of the loyalty oath at the last session of Congress and no doubt will be back again when the new Congress convenes. It is time for the other side to make itself heard.

Soviet Goal: Control of World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article written by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1961. He quotes an official of the CIA.

All Senators should read the article. It will put us back on the track again. We will be able to see the real issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET GOAL: CONTROL OF WORLD—CIA OFFICIAL CALLS MOSCOW TACTICS THE LANGUAGE OF TOTAL WAR

(By David Lawrence)

The Soviet Government would like to have everybody in the world think that the Castro demand for a reduction in the American Embassy staff in Havana, which led to the break in diplomatic relations with Cuba, is just an isolated affair between Cuba and the United States. The Moscow regime would also like to give the impression that what's happening in Laos is a spontaneous uprising of the people in protest against alleged interference in their internal affairs by the United States.

Actually, both events are the result of Communist initiative and are part of the Soviet offensive in the cold war.

The Castro government in Cuba is advised hourly by Communist representatives just what to do to aggravate relations with the United States. The Soviet Government, moreover, is engaging in a worldwide offensive designed to gain by so-called peaceful conquest a dominant position on every continent.

Recently Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, made a little-noted speech that tells a good deal about the Soviet strategy and motives. The CIA gathers information about the cold war which is constantly being furnished to the highest officials of the U.S. Government.

General Cabell naturally chooses his words carefully, and the conclusions he draws can be accepted as authoritative. He says:

What? The answer is, simply, the world. Call it conquest, domination, or control, their aim, as stated by themselves and as demonstrated in their actions, is to destroy freedom in the world and to impose a Communist structure on the whole globe.

"Theirs is the language of total war. They have a consistency and a single-mindedness about promoting a world revolution which is unique in the history of dictatorships. We have been warned before, by Hitler, of plans for world domination. We cannot ignore the present, clear Communist warning."

"The Soviets have one great intangible resource which can best be described as gall. They are showing ever-increasing confidence and even arrogance about their growth, both in material things and in influence."

"We in Intelligence consider that the only sensible view of Communist intentions is that they seek to destroy us by any means which they can use."

"The next question is, how? Will it be by direct military attack or by long-term erosion? The answer is both. If we display weakness in our Military Establishment, if they believe they could strike without suffering unacceptable damage in return, then they will strike. Similarly, if we maintain soft spots in our nonmilitary posture at home and around the world they will, as they have in the past, seek to exploit these weaknesses."

"In their nonmilitary arsenal they have at their disposal all the open techniques of diplomacy, trade, foreign aid, and cultural missions which, when used by almost any other country, would be legitimate arms of official government business. The Communists have in addition local parties in nearly every country in the world—parties trained and directed by Moscow, as at the recent meeting, and dedicated to the overthrow of representative governments."

"This is no secret. * * * The Soviets have boasted that there are active Communist parties in 87 countries in the world."

"The Soviets have the greatest and most expensive propaganda machine the world has ever known."

"Several years ago we were inclined to say that what goes on far across the Atlantic or the Pacific does not really affect us. Then we began to recognize the real intentions of the Communists. Several months ago we could still have said: 'Today Laos is in danger; tomorrow it may be somewhere else, perhaps closer to home.' Now we are forced to say: 'Today Laos and today Cuba, 90 miles from our shores.'"

"Behind their curtain of secrecy, they believe that they can make preparations for a surprise military attack."

"In answer to the question: 'When will the Communists strike?'—the answer is they have attacked, they are attacking, and they will continue to attack."

The foregoing is an example of what our high officials are being told every day about Communist intrigue and the way the cold war is being fought. But do the American people realize what's happening? Judging from some of the comments made in Congress, it is questionable whether the legislators themselves are aware of the far-reaching significance of the Soviet capture of the Castro government.

It is naturally assumed that the people of the United States would disapprove of any military action to counter the Communist moves. This has been said so often that the Moscow regime believes it can go to almost any lengths and yet not meet any real resistance from the United States. Scarcely a day goes by that there aren't hints of appeasement from persons who are close to President-elect Kennedy. They talk about giving up Formosa or recognizing the Peiping regime or admitting Red China to the United Nations—all of which is grist to the Communist mill.

A46

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 5

The real decision will have to be made soon—whether the new administration is going to face up to the Communist threat and call the Soviet bluff. Laos and Cuba are incidental to the larger aspects of the cold war.

Resolved, That the board of directors of the New York Convention and Visitors Bureau strongly recommend legislation to create and support a Federal Travel Office within the framework of the U.S. Government.

At Princeton, there are perhaps 500 to 600 students interested, out of 3,000 undergraduates, according to Donald Emerson, a senior and leading campus advocate of the peace corps.

Emerson, whose father is U.S. consul at Salisbury, in the Central African Federation, said there were other Princeton students who have failed to join the corps boosters only because they think such a program would take 2 to 3 years to get off the ground.

Tourist Travel to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions I have received from the 30th World Travel Congress of the American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., and the board of directors of the New York Convention and Visitors Bureau, relating to methods of increasing tourist travel to the United States.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 30th World Travel Congress of the American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., favors the increase of international pleasure travel as a means of promoting world peace and international understanding; and

Whereas the United States of America welcomes visitors from abroad and is desirous of sharing its natural beauties, its cities, and villages, and its historic shrines with them; and

Whereas there is a need for the development of programs designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Congress favors the passage of Federal legislation to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of International Travel to encourage foreign residents to visit the United States of America and to facilitate international travel.

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF A FEDERAL TRAVEL PROMOTION OFFICE UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NEW YORK CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1960

Whereas the current balance of world trade is unfavorable to the United States by nearly \$2 billion, a disparity which has increased fourfold over the past 10 years and is a serious hazard to our national economy; and

Whereas international travel is the largest single factor in this lack of balance, with \$1,992 million being spent by U.S. citizens in travel to foreign countries, with only approximately \$992 million coming into this country as the result of travel to the United States from abroad; and

Whereas the United States is unique in that it is the only major country in the world without a Federal office to promote tourist travel from other countries, to bring in new dollars which flow into all channels of business; and

Whereas one of the most effective means of realigning the balance of trade would be the establishment of a Federal Travel Office to stimulate tourist travel to the United States from abroad: Therefore be it

Student Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the peace corps proposal made by President-elect Kennedy during the recent election campaign has already stirred widespread enthusiasm among those whom such a program would enlist.

As a visitor to several college campuses in recent months, I witnessed this enthusiasm firsthand. Students have told me that they are waiting for the opportunity to serve the cause of world peace in a very direct way. They have asked, with some impatience, when they will be able to sign up for service abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two items which tell of the response in New Jersey. One article, a United Press International dispatch of December 16, 1960, describes the reaction at Princeton and Rutgers Universities. The other article is an editorial from the Jersey Journal of December 16, 1960.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth Daily Journal, Dec. 16, 1960]

PRINCETON, RUTGERS STUDENTS BACK "PEACE CORPS" PROPOSAL

TRENTON.—A few hundred students at Princeton and Rutgers Universities are boosting a proposed peace corps of talented young Americans serving in undeveloped countries.

President-elect John F. Kennedy supported such a plan during his campaign. Young men would satisfy their military service requirements by enlisting in the corps. Young women could serve, too.

According to one program, the plan would enlist college graduates, give them 6 months' training in the United States and 6 more abroad, and require 2 to 2½ years of duty abroad.

Emphasis would be given to instructing underdeveloped lands in such basic skills as languages, sanitation, health practices, and engineering.

At New Jersey's two largest universities, campus leaders report an enthusiastic reaction among students who have been interested in current events.

SPRINGFIELD LEADER

However, such students are in the minority. At Rutgers, 120 boys said they would like to serve in such a program, out of a student body of 3,000 young men, according to Michael Goodman, of 54 Garden Avenue, Springfield.

But Goodman, a junior and a proponent of the plan, said 120 should be sufficient. The peace corps now contemplated would be able to enlist on the average only about 20 boys from a campus the size of Rutgers, he said.

CONFERENCE HELD

The higher interest at Princeton is traceable in part to a conference on the plan held at the university November 11-12. The meeting was attended by 150 delegates and observers from eastern colleges, government agencies, and industry.

The daily newspapers of both universities have devoted extensive space to explanations of the program.

Several student supporters emphasized that the program would call for greater sacrifice than military service.

"Since the plan calls for participants to serve 3 years, while the average military service is 6 months to 2 years, it would not attract mere draft-dodgers," said Rutgers Senior Stephen Shoenholz of Newark.

Goodman said that if the Nation approves the peace corps idea, 25,000 college graduates could be enrolled in the program.

Not only would corps members be helping underdeveloped nations, but they would also be enlarging their field of knowledge enormously, said Edward Cubberley, of Trenton, president of the Rutgers Student Council.

[From the Jersey Journal, Dec. 16, 1960]

STUDENT PEACE CORPS

Rutgers and Princeton students are speaking up for a "peace corps" to be composed of young men to go abroad and teach less advanced nations such things as literacy, sanitation, hygiene and simple engineering. They take their cue from one of President-elect Kennedy's campaign proposals.

It is proposed that such service be in lieu of military training. With the required preparation, the "peace service" abroad would use more of the young man's time than the military obligation does; hence it would be unlikely to attract those seeking to dodge service.

Would not this idea combine something of the basic goals of both the Marshall plan and the depression-born Civilian Conservation Corps? The CCC was one of the New Deal's most successful projects; it did great things for young men who could not find employment and it did much good and valuable conservation work in our forests.

A peace corps of the kind outlined would truly wage peace, build good will for us abroad and educate a body of young Americans to provide better bonds with other nations of the world.

New York State Tribute to George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the name George Washington Carver holds an honored place in the annals of American science. In the deeper historic sense, the life of this remarkable man